

Section 2: Plan Development

Agency Participation and Documentation

Thirty-two agencies agreed to commit to the development of King County's first multi-jurisdictional hazard mitigation planning effort. These agencies actively participated in weekly work group sessions and monthly participant meetings. Their specific involvement included many activities such as collecting and developing data, providing input, reviewing the plan document, and submitting formal documentation identifying their intent to adopt the final approved plan.

Participating agencies included:

Cities - 9

- City of Auburn
- City of Burien
- City of Duval
- City of Federal Way
- City of Kirkland
- City of Newcastle
- City of North Bend
- City of SeaTac
- City of Woodinville

Utility Districts - 12

- Cedar River Water and Sewer District - Renton
- Coal Creek Utility District - Newcastle
- King County Water District #20 - Seattle
- King County Water District #49 - Burien
- King County Water District #54 – Des Moines
- King County Water District #90 – Renton
- Midway Sewer District
- Shoreline Water District
- Soos Creek Utility District - Renton
- Southwest Suburban Sewer District - Seattle
- Ronald Waste Water District
- Val Vue Water District

Fire Districts – 7

- Federal Way Fire & Life Safety (KCFD #39)
- King County Fire District #2 - Burien

King County Fire District #16 - Northshore
King County Fire District #26 - Des Moines
King County Fire District #40 - Renton
King County Fire District #45 – Duvall
Woodinville Fire & Life Safety (KCFD #36)

School Districts - 3

Lake Washington School District
Snoqualmie School District
Highline School District

King County Government - 1

King County Assessments
King County Adult Detention
King County Development & Environmental Services
King County Emergency Management
King County Facilities
King County Information & Telecommunications
King County Natural Resources & Parks
King County Property Services
King County Public Health
King County Radio Communications
King County Sheriff's Office
King County Transportation

Planning Process

Background

King County Government and King County Office of Emergency Management have been leaders in regional response planning since 1998. In an extension of regional planning efforts already underway, we encouraged local partners to take advantage of common background elements required in the Hazard Mitigation Plan Act of 2000.

In June 2002, King County Executive Sims formally invited 154 agencies to participate in a multi-jurisdiction regional hazard mitigation planning process. In December 2003, the County received a \$100,000 grant from Washington State Emergency Management Division to help support this effort. In March 2003, the Emergency Management Advisory Committee (EMAC) sent a second invitation to the same regional partners. As a result, 78 agencies expressed interest and submitted signatory forms to become a regional partner.

While many cities and special purpose districts took advantage of this synergy, some opted to write mitigation plans independently. Some of the latter also chose to contribute to the Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan content, or indicated intent to do so in the future. There were many jurisdictions that were unable to commit to planning efforts at that time and are presently working toward development of a hazard mitigation plan for submission to FEMA on or before the November 1st, 2004 deadline. Additionally, some agencies expressed their intention to participate in our next phase of the regional planning process which starts in March, 2004.

Planning Deadlines

Planning timelines were largely established based on the planning grant received by Washington State Emergency Management Division. The plan deadline for submittal to FEMA was January 8, 2004; therefore the submittal deadline to the State of Washington was one month prior, December 8, 2003. The State reviewed the plan, and upon their approval forwarded it on to FEMA by the January due date.

Participation Requirements

In addition to providing a signatory form, each participating agency was expected to attend work group meetings, submit required data, write their own mitigation strategy and initiatives, participate in a public review process, and submit an approved “intention to adopt” resolution before December 8th, 2003.

Planning Process

The planning process consisted of multiple phases and teams, including a task force, work groups, and partners group.

The Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan “task force” included representatives from participating agencies who acted as a guiding body for the direction of the regional plan and work group activities. The task force met once a month to review work progress, adoption process and public participation efforts.

Originally, participating agencies met once a month as a group. When a review of the RHMP progress and information submitted by jurisdictions was conducted late in the spring of 2003, it became evident that some agencies had made substantial progress in the planning progress while other agencies had not. For this reason, participants were divided into two groups – one with a submission deadline of December 8, 2003 and a second group to convene for a March, 2004 planning phase. Only those with December 8th deadline targets participated in work group sessions. New March 2004 workgroups will be formed after the December 8th deadline is met. Work groups were segregated into operational areas: schools, cities, utilities, fire districts, and King County government

agencies. They met every week to discuss selected topics, submit data and review draft plan documents. Eventually the schools joined the cities workgroup to consolidate meeting schedules.

In an effort to pull together the entire process, all participants and interested parties met once a month at the “RHMP Partners Meeting.” This forum provided an opportunity to brief everyone on plan status, distribute draft documents, share information and provide for agency comments and feedback.

RHMP Work Plan

An aggressive work plan was developed and implemented in August of 2003 toward the December 8th submission date. Each week involved collection of background information from participants toward construction of the regional profile and hazard identification and vulnerability assessment (HIVA). In addition, the work plan developed information in support of each jurisdiction’s individual mitigation strategy and initiatives.

Week	Topic(s)
1	Signatory agreements, critical facilities, and dependent populations
2	History of events and losses, repetitive losses
3	Probability of events, estimate of catastrophic losses
4	Identify existing mitigation funding sources
5	Benefit cost analysis, priority issues for mitigation, schedule public presentations in interested jurisdictions
6	Review sample strategies, review plan drafts
7	Receive and review jurisdictions strategy drafts, review plan drafts
8	Create regional mitigation strategy from composite of jurisdiction strategies
9	Existing jurisdiction mitigation policies and regulations
10	Jurisdiction initiatives
11	Distribution of composite RHMP draft
12	Review and intention to adopt documents due

King County Emergency Management Staff Support

The King County contribution to the development of the regional hazard mitigation plan consisted of two full-time Project Management III staff, one contract temporary technical writer and volunteer staff support. These staff resources were dedicated to the facilitating regional participation, coordinating the planning process, research and collecting data, writing the plan, and conducting public presentations. Office of Emergency Management staff also provided support and guidance to partner agencies as requested and developed

and maintained a RHMP website for benefit of partner agencies and the general public

Data Collection and Mitigation 20/20 Software

The County received a copy of “Mitigation 20/20” software as part of the State grant. This “Microsoft Access” database program provided a step-by-step method to help agencies collect and evaluate hazard mitigation data. We provided a limited version of the County’s master copy to interested signatories, per the licensing agreement. While the software was somewhat useful for single jurisdictions, it did not lend itself to the political jurisdictional environment in King County or to a true regional hazard mitigation planning effort. In addition, some agencies did not have the computer hardware or software capability to run the program. Forms and data generated and collected in the Mitigation 20/20 software format was somewhat useful as a standard for collecting data in hardcopy form and was instrumental in the writing of many parts of the plan.

Other agencies opted to use their own methods for collecting, documenting and evaluating data for their plan. This information was manually integrated with other data submitted via the Mitigation 20/20 format.

Plan Adoption

The December 8, 2003 submission date and the RHMP work plan left very little time for the regional partners to review and adopt the final composite of the draft plan. For this reason, the plan sections were released to the partners as they were drafted for comment and reviewed at the weekly work group meetings. Draft documents were also made available on line at the King County Office of Emergency Management website at www.metrokc.gov/prepare as they were completed. Partners and citizens alike were given access to the documents in this fashion.

Intention to Adopt – Individual Agencies

Each jurisdiction chose to pass resolutions expressing their intention to adopt the King County Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan upon acceptance of the plan by Washington State Emergency Management and FEMA. This was done at different points in the process per the desires of each jurisdiction. Documentation of the adoption resolution was a requirement for acknowledgement of the jurisdiction’s successful participation in the hazard mitigation planning process. All participating agencies in this planning session met this requirement as identified in the annex in Section 10. Original resolutions are kept on file at the King County Office of Emergency Management.

King County Government Adoption

Public Involvement

The planning process attempted to provide opportunity for public involvement in a variety of ways at every step. While we recognized this topic was typically of interest to specific individuals and groups, we tried to provide appropriate opportunity to gain public interest and feedback. We felt it was important to educate the public on the hazard mitigation planning process as well as the specific work being done by the various agencies contributing to the plan.

We also acknowledged the need to reach individuals and groups at all levels in a way that met their needs. To accomplish this we approached the task using several different methods:

Television

In March 2003, the County produced and aired a "Project Impact" segment featuring the Director of Emergency Management, Task Force members and RHMP project staff. The production, televised on County Television (CTV), focused on the types of hazards that occur in our region and the benefits to developing a multi-jurisdictional regional hazard mitigation plan. This segment was available to a potential viewing population of _____ throughout King County. At the end of the project in December 2003, the RHMP partners intend to develop a follow-up program to highlight important components of the final plan.

Internet/Website

A portion of the King County's Emergency Management website was specifically dedicated to regional hazard mitigation planning. This site was developed and remains as a tool for participating agencies as well as the general public. It contains information on hazard mitigation planning, help for participating agencies, resources, draft and final plan components, as well as a method for providing comments and feedback. The website address is <http://www.metrokc.gov/prepare/kcrhmp>.

Public Meetings

As the RHMP was being developed, Office of Emergency Management staff conducted presentations to a variety of political and community groups, including commissioners, city councils, emergency managers and the general public. Many of these meetings and/or presentations were provided as a direct result from public requests. To insure a formal opportunity for the public to provide input, staff and members of the RHMP Partners group hosted _____ public meetings, each at a different location within the county. Meeting content included an

overview of the hazard mitigation process and the plan as it was being developed.

The public presentations completed prior to the submission of the plan to Washington State Emergency Management are listed as an “annex” in Section 10.

Citizen Involvement

The RHMP group benefited greatly from the interest and involvement of a private citizen who was willing to dedicate time and disaster-related expertise to the project. He contributed by doing research, developing sections of the plan, reviewing the draft document, and helping to facilitate meetings.

For participating agencies, the review process was incorporated into the weekly work group meetings and monthly RHMP partner meetings. Partners were provided with draft documents in hard copy and/or via electronic format for their review.

Public Review Comment Period/Process

Comments were received through a variety of means, including e-mails, website (electronic form), public meeting minutes, and written correspondence. All written comments were acknowledged in writing when a return address was provided. Action on comments received prior to November 8, 2003 was addressed by the RHMP Task Force prior to the submission of the King County Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan to Washington State Emergency Management. Any written comments received after November 8, 2003 but before March 1, 2004 were acknowledged in writing where a return address is provided and will be considered by the King County Regional Hazard Mitigation Task Force during the March 2004 plan revision.

Documentation

King County Office of Emergency Management, the coordinating agency, documented meeting attendance and participation activities.

Meetings

Data Collection

Plan Comments/public review

(Writing still to be done)

All plan comments were addressed and documented. For comments that were not included in the final plan, written justification is provided.

~ Draft ~

A summary of this information is provided as an “annex” in Section 10.